Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	, 10/748,712	RICHLEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ginger T. Chapman	3761
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: <u>pending</u>
(1) <u>Ginger T. Chapman</u> .	(3)	
(2) Andrew D Stover.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 28 February 2007	Time: <u>2:33p.m.</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		·
Claims discussed:		
29, 1, 2, 6-8		
Prior art documents discussed: US 2004/0122401 A1, US 6,132,410 (Van Gompel); US 4,	437,860 (Sigl)	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G	SENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation of result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur</li> </ul>	n. The examiner will provide a trate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
	•	
·		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During the telephone interview with Applicants' representative Applicants' amendment clarifying the positions of the first and second adhesive regions were noted, embodiments reviewed and the discussion continued on clarifying the first and second adhesives by incorporating the limitations of dependent claim 1 and independent claim 29.